

REMARKS AND ELECTION

The Examiner states that the present application contains six patentably distinct inventions: the embodiments of (a) Figs. 1-3; (b) Fig. 4A; (c) Fig. 4B; (d) Fig. 4C; (e) Fig. 5; and (f) Figs. 7 and 8. With these six embodiments patentably distinct, if the Examiner should find only one of the six in the prior art, the other five embodiments are necessarily patentable. As noted at M.P.E.P. §802.01:

The term "distinct" means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, ... but are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER (though they may each be unpatentable because of the prior art).

Emphasis in original. Moreover, if a generic claim is found allowable, then each of the embodiments covered by the generic claim can be contained in the same patent.

Applicant elects patentably distinct species C, the embodiment of Figure 4B. The following claims read on Species C: Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 19.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this requirement since the various embodiments are closely related and the Examiner will not be able to show as required by MPEP §803 "a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required." Furthermore, the Examiner will not be able to show either a separate classification, separate status in the art, or a different field of search, as required by MPEP §808.02.

Finally, Independent claims 1 and 19 were amended to remove unnecessary recitations regarding the razor blade and thereby give these claims an appropriate breadth.

7

Respectfully submitted,
Hassan Awad

By: 

Thomas L. Adams
Reg. No. 27,300
(973)463-0100

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the
United States Patent and Trademark Office on this 15th day of January, 2003


Thomas L. Adams
Registration No. 27,300